arXiv:1610.09062v1 [math.AP] 28 Oct 2016

ISOLATED SINGULARITIES OF POSITIVE SOLUTIONS FOR CHOQUARD EQUATIONS IN SUBLINEAR TYPE CASE

Huyuan Chen

Department of Mathematics, Jiangxi Normal University,
Nanchang, Jiangxi 330022, PR China
Email: chenhuyuan@yeah.net

Feng Zhou

Center for PDEs and Department of Mathematics, East China Normal University,
Shanghai, 200241, PR China
Email: fzhou@math.ecnu.edu.cn

Abstract. Our purpose of this paper is to study the isolated singularities of positive solutions to Choquard equation in the sublinear case $q \in (0,1)$

$$-\Delta u + u = I_\alpha[u^p]u^q \ \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}, \quad \lim_{|x|\to+\infty} u(x) = 0,$$

where $p > 0, N \geq 3, \alpha \in (0,N)$ and $I_\alpha[u^p](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u^p(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy$ is the Riesz potential, which appears as a nonlocal term in the equation. We investigate the nonexistence and existence of isolated singular solutions of Choquard equation under different range of the pair of exponent (p,q). Furthermore, we obtain qualitative properties for the minimal singular solutions of the equation.

1. Introduction

This is a continuation of the work [6] on the study of the isolated singularities of positive solutions to Choquard equation

$$\begin{aligned} &-\Delta u + u = I_\alpha[u^p]u^q \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}, \\ &\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} u(x) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where u is a classical solution in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, $p > 0$, $q > 0$, $N \geq 3$, $\alpha \in (0,N)$ and

$$I_\alpha[u^p](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u^p(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}}\, dy$$

is the Riesz potential, which is related to the fractional Laplacian when $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and it is a nonlocal operator. Here u is said to be a classical solution of (1.1) if $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\})$, $I_\alpha[u^p]$ is well-defined in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ and u satisfies (1.1) pointwisely. We have developed in [6] the method of Lions [15] (e.g. [4]) to classify the isolated singularities of the Choquard equation (1.1) for the case of $q \geq 1$. The essential point to set $q \geq 1$ in [6] is due to the fact that the positive solutions of (1.1) decays exponentially and this fact guarantees the existence of isolated singular solutions. When $0 < q < 1$, the situation of the nonlinearity

AMS Subject Classifications: 35J75, 35B40.

Key words: Classification of singularity; Choquard equation; sublinear case; polynomial decay; Dirac mass.

becomes subtle, because the decay at infinity is no longer exponential and this causes many difficulties for the classification of the isolated singularities and for the construction of singular solutions of the equation.

The Choquard equation is considered as an approximation to Hartree-Fock theory for a one component plasma, which is a semilinear Schrödinger-Newton type equation proposed by P. Choquard (for $N = 3$, $\alpha = p = 2$ and $q = 1$) and explained in Lieb and Lieb-Simon's papers [14, 17] respectively. The Choquard type equations also arise in the physics of multiple-particle systems ([12]). Furthermore, the Choquard type equations appear to a prototype of the nonlocal problems, which play a fundamental role in some Quantum-mechanical and non-linear optics (see e.g. [11, 22]). As far as we know, the most mathematical results about the Choquard equations are known for the case of $q = p - 1$. More precisely, we consider the problem in the variational setting:

$$-\Delta u + u = I_\alpha[|u|^p]|u|^{p-2}u \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N,$$
$$u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

that is, for the solutions which correspond to the critical points of a functional defined on the Sobolev space $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $p \in (1, +\infty)$ satisfies

$$\frac{N-2}{N+\alpha} \le \frac{1}{p} \le \frac{N}{N+\alpha}. \tag{1.2}$$

Then the equation has a groundstate solution $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if p satisfies strictly the inequality in (1.2) (see [20], [18], [14] and in particular [21] which is a survey for the Choquard type equations, the related problems and the related references therein).

Our aim in this article focuses on the study of the Choqurad equation (1.1) when $q \in (0, 1)$. Without special explanation, we always assume in the sequel that

$$\mathbf{N \ge 3}, \ \ \alpha \in (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{N}), \ \ \mathbf{p > 0} \ \text{ and } \ \mathbf{q} \in (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}).$$

We emphasize that the problem we treated is in general non-variational and the solutions are considered in the distributional sense. Our first result states the nonexistence of positive solution of (1.1).

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that*

$$(1 - \frac{\alpha}{N})p + q < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p + q < 1 + \frac{\alpha}{N-2}. \tag{1.3}$$

Then problem (1.1) has no any nonnegative nontrivial solution.

Notice that in [20], the authors showed an elegant results on the groundstates for the case $q = p - 1$ and gave the optimal range of p for the existence of the groundstates solution. In fact, they proved that (1.1) has no nontrivial solution when $p \ge \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2}$ or $p \le 1 + \frac{\alpha}{N}$, at least for groundstates solutions by applying Pohožaev identity. In our case, the distributional solution are weaker than the variational solution, and we consider the pair exponent (p, q) in the planar domain, so the range of (p, q) for the existence or nonexistence of distributional solution are delicate. It would be larger than the one in variational sense.

Next we present the classification of singularities of (1.1), inspired by [6].

Theorem 1.2. *Let u be a nonnegative classical solution of (1.1) and*

$$(1 - \frac{\alpha}{N})p + q \ge 1 \qquad \text{or} \qquad p + q \ge 1 + \frac{\alpha}{N-2}. \tag{1.4}$$

We assume that (i) $u^p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ or (ii) $u^p \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and there exist $\bar\alpha \in (\alpha, N)$ and $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$u^p(x) \le c_0|x|^{-\bar\alpha}, \quad \forall\, |x| > 1.$$

Then there exists $k \geq 0$ such that u is a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u + u &= I_\alpha[u^p]u^q + k\delta_0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \lim_{|x|\to\infty} u(x) &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

in the sense of distribution, that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u(-\Delta\xi) + u\xi - I_\alpha[u^p]u^q\xi)\, dx = k\xi(0), \quad \forall \xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N), \tag{1.6}$$

where $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is the space of all the functions in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with compact support.

Furthermore, (i) when

$$p + q \geq \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2} \quad \text{or} \quad p \geq \frac{N}{N-2}, \tag{1.7}$$

then $k = 0$.

(ii) When

$$p + q < \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2} \quad \text{and} \quad p < \frac{N}{N-2}. \tag{1.8}$$

If $k = 0$, then u is a classical solution of

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u + u &= I_\alpha[u^p]u^q \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \lim_{|x|\to+\infty} u(x) &= 0; \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

if $k > 0$, then u satisfies that

$$\lim_{|x|\to 0^+} u(x)|x|^{N-2} = c_N k, \tag{1.10}$$

where c_N is the normalized constant depending only on N.

The Choquard equation (1.1) could be divided into a system of equations with the Laplacian in the linear part of the first equation and fractional Laplacian in the second one. We remark that the Dirac mass only appears in the first equation for the system. This is different for considering the system directly. As in [6], the basic tool we used to connect the singular solutions of elliptic equation in punctured domain and the solutions of corresponding elliptic equation in the distributional sense is an early result [4] due to Brezis and Lions on the study of isolated singularities. It is well known that the study of singularities of semilinear elliptic equations is a major subject in PDEs and they have been investigated widely for decades (see for example [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 19, 23]).

Note that in [GT], the authors gave some very interesting results on the behavior of the isolated singularity for positive subsolution $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\})$ of the Choquard type inequality

$$0 \leq -\Delta u = I_\alpha[u^p]u^q \quad \text{in} \quad B_1(0) \setminus \{0\},$$

where the methods on analysis of the singularities are also different. In particular the solution for their case is a superhamonic function and the operator that we consider here is $-\Delta + Id$.

As we have mentioned above, the case of $0 < q < 1$ is delicate, at least for the methods we have used in [6] for the classification of isolated singularities and existence of solutions. In fact, as showed by Moroz and Van Schaftingen in [MVS] and [MVS1], the solutions of the Choquard equation may have polynomial decay at infinity, which makes the classification of singularities difficult. The polynomial decay at infinity can not guarantee that $I_\alpha[u^p]$ is well defined and then it may cause the nonexistence of solutions for the equation. However, we can still prove the existence results stated as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that $(p,q) \in (0, \frac{N}{N-2}) \times (0,1)$ satisfies (1.4) and $p+q < \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2}$.*

Then there exists $k^* > 0$ such that for $k \in (0, k^*)$, problem (1.5) admits a minimal positive solution u_k in the distribution sense, which is a classical solution of (1.1) and satisfies (1.10).

Moreover, if

$$(1-\frac{\alpha}{N})p + q > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p+q < \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2}, \tag{1.11}$$

the solution u_k has the decay at infinity as

$$\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} u_k(x)|x|^{\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}} = \|u_k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{p}{1-q}}; \tag{1.12}$$

if

$$(1-\frac{\alpha}{N})p + q \le 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 + \frac{\alpha}{N-2} \le p+q < \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2}, \tag{1.13}$$

the solution u_k has the decay at infinity as

$$\limsup_{|x|\to+\infty} u_k(x)|x|^{\max\{N-2, \frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}\}} \le k \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{|x|\to+\infty} u_k(x)|x|^{\max\{N-2, \frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}\}} > 0. \tag{1.14}$$

For the proof of this theorem, the standard iterating procedure (see e.g. [23]) is adopted to obtain the existence of singular solutions of (1.1) and the main part is to construct a suitable upper bound for the procedure. Furthermore, this upper bound provides the first estimate in (1.14), and combining (1.12), we may conclude that $\|u_k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \le k^{\frac{1-q}{p}}$. The proof of (1.12) is motivated by [20], where the authors provided the decay estimate for the positive ground state solution of

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u + u &= I_\alpha[u^p]u^{p-1} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \lim_{|x|\to+\infty} u(x) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Our method is to set for $u^p \le |x|^{-\beta}$ with $\beta > N$. However, u^p is even no longer in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if (1.11) fails. In fact, from Lemma 2.1 below, we have that $u_k \ge c_1|x|^{\tau_0}$ for $|x| > 1$, where $c_1 > 0$ and $\tau_0 = -\max\{N-2, \frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}\}$. The upper bound for the decay at infinity could be seen in Lemma 3.2 where we construct super solutions to control iterating procedure for the existence of u_k. When $\alpha \in (0,2]$, conditions (1.3) and (1.4) could be reduced into $(1-\frac{\alpha}{N})p + q < 1$ and $(1-\frac{\alpha}{N})p + q \ge 1$ respectively.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the non-existence of positive solution of (1.1). In Section 3 we classify the singularities for equation (1.1) when the pair of exponent (p,q) satisfies (1.4), and prove the existence of singular solutions and show that the decay (1.12) holds.

2. Nonexistence

We prove the nonexistence of weak solution of (1.1) by contradiction. Assume that problem (1.1) admits a nonnegative nontrivial solution u, and then we will obtain a contradiction by the the blowing up phenomena derived from its decay at infinity. Let

$$\tau_0 = -\max\{\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}, N-2\} \tag{2.1}$$

and denote by $\{\tau_j\}_j$ the sequence

$$\tau_j = \frac{\alpha}{1-q} + \frac{p}{1-q}\tau_{j-1} \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, 2, 3\cdots. \tag{2.2}$$

We start with the following

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that (p, q) satisfies (1.3), then $\{\tau_j\}_j$ is an increasing sequence and there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\tau_{j_0-1} < -\frac{\alpha}{p} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{j_0} \geq -\frac{\alpha}{p}. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Since $q \in (0,1)$, we have that $\tau_1 - \tau_0 > 0$ is equivalent to

$$\tau_0(1-p-q) < \alpha. \tag{2.4}$$

We observe that (2.4) is obvious for $p+q \leq 1$, and when $p+q > 1$, (2.4) holds if

$$\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q} < \frac{\alpha}{p+q-1} \quad \text{and} \quad N-2 < \frac{\alpha}{p+q-1},$$

which is exactly equivalent to condition (1.3). Notice also that

$$\tau_j - \tau_{j-1} = \frac{p}{1-q}(\tau_{j-1} - \tau_{j-2}) = \left(\frac{p}{1-q}\right)^{j-1}(\tau_1 - \tau_0), \tag{2.5}$$

which implies that the sequence $\{\tau_j\}_j$ is increasing under the condition (1.3). If $\frac{p}{1-q} \geq 1$, the conclusion is clear. If $\frac{p}{1-q} \in (0,1)$, it deduces from (2.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_j &= \frac{1-\left(\frac{p}{1-q}\right)^j}{1-\frac{p}{1-q}}(\tau_1-\tau_0)+\tau_0 \\ &\to \frac{1-q}{1-p-q}(\tau_1-\tau_0)+\tau_0 = \frac{\alpha}{1-p-q} > 0, \quad \text{as} \quad j \to +\infty,\end{aligned}$$

then there exists $j_0 > 0$ satisfying (2.3). □

Proposition 2.1. *Let u be a nonnegative and nontrivial classical solution of (1.1), then there exists $b_0 > 0$ such that*

$$u(x) \geq b_0|x|^{\tau_0} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| \geq 1, \tag{2.6}$$

where τ_0 is given by (2.1).

Proof. Since u is nonnegative, then $I_\alpha[u^p]u^q \geq 0$ and by the Strong Maximum Principle we have that $u > 0$ in$\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$ since u is a nontrivial solution.

Step 1. We claim that there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$I_\alpha[u^p](x) \geq c_2 \min\{1, |x|^{\alpha-N}\}, \qquad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}. \tag{2.7}$$

In fact, fix a point x_0 with $|x_0| = 1$, there exists $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$u^p \geq c_3 \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)},$$

then for $|x| \geq 2$ and $|y| < \frac{3}{2}$, we have that $|x-y| \leq |x| + |y| \leq 2|x|$ and then

$$\begin{aligned}I_\alpha[u^p](x) &\geq c_3 \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy \\ &\geq c_3(2|x|)^{\alpha-N} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)} dy \geq c_4|x|^{\alpha-N}.\end{aligned}$$

For $|x| \leq 2$ and $|y| < \frac{3}{2}$, we have that $|x-y| \leq 4$ and

$$I_\alpha[u^p](x) \geq c_3 \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy \geq 4^{\alpha-N} c_3 |B_{1/2}(0)|. \tag{2.8}$$

Therefore, (2.7) holds.

Let

$$v_1(x) = \begin{cases} c_4|x|^{\tau_0} & \text{if} \quad |x| \geq 1, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad |x| < 1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$c_4 = \min\left\{(c_2 q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}, \min_{x\in\partial B_1(0)} u(x)\right\}.$$

Step 2. We show that v_1 satisfies

$$-\Delta v_1 \leq c_2|x|^{\alpha-N} v_1^q - v_1 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}. \tag{2.9}$$

Since $\tau_0 \leq 2-N$, then for $|x|>1$,

$$-\Delta v_1 \leq 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c_2|x|^{\alpha-N} v_1^q - v_1 &= v_1^q[c_2|x|^{\alpha-N} - v_1^{1-q}(x)] \\ &\geq v_1^q\left[c_2|x|^{\alpha-N} - c_2 q|x|^{\tau_0(1-q)}\right] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. We prove finally that

$$u \geq v_1 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}. \tag{2.10}$$

Let $f(r,t) = c_2 r^{\alpha-N} t^q - t$, then $t \mapsto f(r,t)$ is decreasing in $(0, (c_2 q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} r^{\tau_0})$. In fact,

$$\partial_t f(r,t) = c_2 q r^{\alpha-N} t^{q-1} - 1 < 0 \quad \text{for} \quad t \in (0, (c_2 q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} r^{\tau_0}).$$

If (2.10) fails, since $u \geq v_1$ on $\partial B_1(0)$, we may assume that there exists some point x in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$ such that $u(x) - v_1(x) < 0$, denoting

$$l_0 = \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B_1(0)} (u - v_1)(x) < 0$$

and the set $A_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0) : \ u(x) - v_1(x) < \frac{l_0}{2}\}$ is a nonempty, C^2- bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$. We see that for any $x \in A_0$, $0 < u(x) < v_1(x) \leq (c_2 q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}|x|^{\tau_0}$, so by the fact that $t \mapsto f(r,t)$ is decreasing in $(0, (c_2 q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} r^{\tau_0})$, we obtain that

$$c_2|x|^{\alpha-N} u^q(x) - u(x) \geq c_2|x|^{\alpha-N} v_1^q(x) - v_1(x)$$

and

$$-\Delta(u - v_1 - \frac{l_0}{2}) \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \ \ A_0, \quad u - v_1 - \frac{l_0}{2} = 0 \quad \text{on} \ \ \partial A_0.$$

By Maximum Principle, we have that $u \geq v_1 + \frac{l_0}{2}$ in A_0, which is impossible with the definition of A_0. This ends the proof of the lemma. □

Remark 2.1. *Notice that the decay estimate (2.6) holds without the restrictions (1.3), so (2.6) could provide a lower decay estimate at infinity in the case of (1.4).*

The following proposition is an improvement of the decay of u at infinity.

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that $p > 0$, $q \in (0,1)$ verify (1.3). Let $\{\tau_j\}_j$ defined in (2.2) with τ_0 given by (2.1), u be a classical solution of (1.1) satisfying*

$$u(x) \geq b_j|x|^{\tau_j}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$$

for some $b_j > 0$ and $j \leq j_0 - 1$. Then there exists $b_{j+1} > 0$ such that

$$u(x) \geq b_{j+1}|x|^{\tau_{j+1}}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}.$$

Proof. Step 1. We prove that there exists $a_j > 0$ such that

$$I_\alpha[u^p](x) \geq a_j \min\{1,\, |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p}\}, \qquad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}.$$

We observe that for $|x| \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha[u^p](x) &\geq b_j^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0)} |x-y|^{\alpha-N} |y|^{\tau_j p} dy \\ &= b_j^p |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{1}{|x|}}(0)} |e_x - z|^{\alpha-N} |z|^{\tau_j p} dz \\ &\geq 2^{\alpha-N} b_j^p |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0)} |z|^{\alpha-N} |z|^{\tau_j p} dz \\ &\geq a_j |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p}, \end{aligned}$$

where $e_x = \frac{x}{|x|}$. Together with (2.8) for $|x| < 1$, we conclude that

$$I_\alpha[u^p](x) \geq a_j \min\{1,\, |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p}\}, \qquad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}.$$

Let

$$v_t(x) = \begin{cases} t|x|^{\tau_{j+1}} & \text{if} \quad |x| \geq 1, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad |x| < 1, \end{cases}$$

where $t > 0$ will be chosen later.

Step 2. We claim that there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that for $t \in (0, t_1)$

$$-\Delta v_t \leq a_j |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p} v_t^q - v_t \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}. \tag{2.11}$$

For $|x| > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_j |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p} v_t^q - v_t &= t^q \left[a_j |x|^{\alpha+p\tau_j+q\tau_{j+1}} - t^{1-q} |x|^{\tau_{j+1}} \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} a_j t^q |x|^{\alpha+p\tau_j+q\tau_{j+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality requires that

$$t \leq \left(\frac{a_j}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha + p\tau_j + q\tau_{j+1} = \tau_{j+1}.$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$-\Delta v_t(x) \leq t|\tau_j(\tau_j + N - 2)||x|^{\tau_{j+1}-2} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| > 1.$$

Then we obtain (2.11) if we choose

$$t_1 = \min\left\{ \left(\frac{a_j}{2|\tau_j(\tau_j + N - 2)| + 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}},\, \left(\frac{a_j}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}},\, (a_j q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}},\, \min_{x \in \partial B_1(0)} u(x) \right\}.$$

Step 3. We prove finally that

$$u \geq v_t \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}. \tag{2.12}$$

The proof is very similar to prove (2.10). Let $f(r,t) = a_j r^{\alpha+\tau_j p} t^q - t$, then $t \mapsto f(r,t)$ is decreasing in $(0,\, (a_j q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} r^{\tau_{j+1}})$. If (2.12) fails, since $u \geq v_t$ on $\partial B_1(0)$, we may assume that there exists some point in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$ such that $u(x) - v_t(x) < 0$, then

$$l_j = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0)} (u - v_t)(x) < 0$$

and the set $A_j = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)} : \ u(x) - v_t(x) < \frac{l_j}{2}\}$ is a nonempty, C^2- bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \overline{B_1(0)}$. We see that for any $x \in A_j$, $0 < u(x) < v_t(x) \le (a_j q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} |x|^{\tau_{j+1}}$, so

$$a_j |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p} u^q(x) - u(x) \ge a_j |x|^{\alpha+\tau_j p} v_t^q(x) - v_t(x)$$

and

$$-\Delta(u - v_t - \frac{l_j}{2}) \ge 0 \quad \text{in} \ \ A_j, \quad u - v_t - \frac{l_j}{2} = 0 \quad \text{on} \ \ \partial A_j.$$

By Maximum Principle, we have that $u \ge v_t + \frac{l_j}{2}$ in A_j, which is impossible with the definition of A_j. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By contradiction, we assume that (1.1) has a nonnegative and nontrivial classical solution $u \ge 0$, then $I_\alpha[u^p]$ is well defined in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$. From Proposition 2.1, we have that

$$u(x) \ge b_0 |x|^{\tau_0} \quad \text{for} \ \ |x| > 1.$$

Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, we may repeat Proposition 2.2, we can improve the decay estimate such that

$$u(x) \ge b_{j_0} |x|^{\tau_{j_0}} \quad \text{for} \ \ |x| > 1,$$

where $\tau_{j_0} \ge -\frac{\alpha}{p}$. Now fix a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $|x_0| = 1$ and we have that

$$I_\alpha[u^p](x_0) \ge b_{j_0}^p 2^{\alpha-N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0)} |y|^{\alpha-N+\tau_{j_0} p} dy = \infty$$

by $\alpha + \tau_{j_0} p \ge 0$. That is impossible, since u is a classical solution of (1.1) in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$. □

3. Classification and Existence

3.1. **Classification.** The classification of singularities of (1.1) follows [6, Theorem 1.1] where we have used essentially the following result.

Theorem 3.1. [4, Theorrem 1.1] *Assume that $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\})$ and $u \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a positive classical solution of*

$$-\Delta u + u = f \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then there exists $k \ge 0$ such that u is a distributional solution of

$$-\Delta u + u = f + k\delta_0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{3.2}$$

that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [u(-\Delta\xi) + u\xi - f\xi]\, dx = k\xi(0), \quad \forall \xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $p > 0$, $q > 0$ and u is a positive classical solution of (1.1) satisfying $u^p \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $u^p(x) \le c_0 |x|^{-\bar\alpha}$ for $|x| > 1$, where $\bar\alpha \in (\alpha, N)$. Then $u \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and*

$$I_\alpha[u^p] u^q \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0)). \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. From [6, Lemma 2.1], we know that $I_\alpha[u^p]u^q \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. For $|x| > 2$ large enough, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha[u^p](x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u^p(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}}dy \\ &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B_1(0)} \frac{|y|^{-\bar\alpha}}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}}dy + \int_{B_1(0)} \frac{u^p(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}}dy \\ &\le |x|^{\alpha-\bar\alpha}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B_{\frac{1}{|x|}}(0)} \frac{|z|^{-\bar\alpha}}{|e_x-z|^{N-\alpha}}dz + (|x|-1)^{\alpha-N}\int_{B_1(0)} u^p(y)dy \\ &\le |x|^{\alpha-\bar\alpha}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|z|^{-\bar\alpha}}{|e_x-z|^{N-\alpha}}dz + |x|^\alpha \|u\|^p_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B_{|x|-r}(0))}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|z|^{-\bar\alpha}}{|e_x-z|^{N-\alpha}}dz &\le 2^{N-\alpha}\int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |z|^{-\bar\alpha}dz + 2^{\bar\alpha}\int_{B_{1/2}(e_1)} \frac{1}{|e_1-z|^{N-\alpha}}dz \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{1+|z|^{N-\alpha+\bar\alpha}}dz \\ &< +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

then we have that

$$\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} I_\alpha[u^p](x) = 0,$$

then it deduces that $I_\alpha[u^p]u^q \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0))$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let u be a nonnegative classical solution of (1.1). If $u^p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, repeat the proof of [6, Theorem 1.1], then we can obtain Theorem 1.2 directly. If $u^p \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we apply Lemma 3.1 to derive that $I_\alpha[u^p]u^q \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_1(0))$, the by applying Theorem 3.1 with $f = I_\alpha[u^p]u^q$, we have that there exists $k \ge 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[u(-\Delta\xi) + u\xi - I_\alpha[u^p]u^q\xi\right] dx = k\xi(0), \quad \forall \xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Let $\mathbb{G}$ the Green's operator defined by the Green kernel of $-\Delta + Id$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$, then by Lemma 3.1, we have that $\mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[u^p]u^q]$ is well-defined. The remaining proof is similar to [6, Theorem 1.1] and we omit here. □

3.2. **Existence.** The key point for the proof of the existence is to construct a suitable upper bound. To this end, we introduce some auxiliary functions. Let

$$\phi(r) = \left(r^{2-N} + r^\tau\right)e^{-\frac{r^2}{2N}} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(r) = (r_0 + |x|)^{\tau_0},$$

where $r_0 = 2\sqrt{\tau_0(\tau_0-1)}$ and $\tau \in (2-N, \min\{0,\ 2+\alpha-(N-2)(p+q)\})$, where we have $2+\alpha-(N-2)(p+q) > 2-N$ by assumption that $p+q < \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2}$.

By direct computation, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi''(r) + \frac{N-1}{r}\phi'(r) &= \left[\tau(\tau+N-2)r^{\tau-2} - \frac{N+2\tau}{N}r^\tau + \frac{1}{N^2}r^{\tau+2}\right]e^{-\frac{r^2}{2N}} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{N-4}{N}r^{2-N} + \frac{1}{N^2}r^{4-N}\right]e^{-\frac{r^2}{2N}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi''(r)+\frac{N-1}{r}\varphi'(r)&=\tau_0(\tau_0-1)(r_0+|x|)^{\tau_0-2}+\tau_0\frac{N-1}{|x|}(r_0+|x|)^{\tau_0-1}\\&\le\tau_0(\tau_0-1)(r_0+|x|)^{\tau_0-2}\\&\le\tau_0(\tau_0-1)\frac{1}{r_0^2}(r_0+|x|)^{\tau_0}\\&=\frac{1}{4}\varphi(r),\end{aligned}$$

then there exists $a_0>0$ such that

$$[\phi''(r)+\frac{N-1}{r}\phi'(r)]+a_0[\varphi''(r)+\frac{N-1}{r}\varphi'(r)]\le\frac{1}{2}[\phi(r)+a_0\varphi(r)],\quad\forall r>0. \tag{3.4}$$

For $k>0$, we define

$$w_k(x)=k[\phi(|x|)+a_0\varphi(|x|)],\quad\forall x\in\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\{0\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Now we prove the following

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that (p,q) satisfies (1.4) and w_k is defined in (3.5). Then there exists k_0 such that for all $0<k\le k_0$, w_k is a super solution of*

$$-\Delta u+u=I_\alpha[u^p]u^q\quad\text{in}\quad\mathbb{R}^N\setminus\{0\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. From (3.4), we have that

$$-\Delta w_k(x)+w_k(x)\ge\frac{1}{2}w_k(x)+c(\tau)kr^{\tau-2}e^{-\frac{r^2}{2N}}, \tag{3.7}$$

where $c(\tau)=-\tau(N-2+\tau)>0$.

We observe that

$$I_\alpha[\varphi^p](x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}}(r_0+|y|)^{\tau_0p}dy:=\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}I(x,y)dy$$

and for $|x|>2r_0$, we have that

$$\int_{B_1(0)}I(x,y)dy\le2^{N-\alpha}|x|^{\alpha-N}\int_{B_1(0)}(r_0+|y|)^{\tau_0p}dy\le c_5|x|^{\alpha-N},$$

$$\int_{B_{\frac{|x|}{2}}(0)\setminus B_1(0)}I(x,y)dy\le2^{N-\alpha}|x|^{\alpha-N}\int_{B_{\frac{|x|}{2}}(0)\setminus B_1(0)}|y|^{\tau_0p}dy\le c_5|x|^{\alpha+\tau_0p},$$

$$\int_{B_{\frac{|x|}{2}}(x)}I(x,y)dy\le2^{-\tau_0p}|x|^{\tau_0p}\int_{B_{\frac{|x|}{2}}(x)}\frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}}dy\le c_5|x|^{\alpha+\tau_0p}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus(B_{\frac{|x|}{2}}(x)\cup B_{\frac{|x|}{2}}(0))}I(x,y)dy\le c_6\int_{\mathbb{R}^N\setminus B_{\frac{|x|}{2}}(0)}|y|^{\alpha-N+\tau_0p}dy\le c_6|x|^{\alpha+\tau_0p}.$$

Thus, there exists $c_7>0$ such that

$$I_\alpha[\varphi^p](x)\le c_7(r_0+|x|)^{\max\{\alpha-N,\,\alpha+\tau_0p\}},\quad|x|>0.$$

Similarly, we have that for $|x|>1$

$$I_\alpha[\phi^p](x)\le c_7|x|^{\alpha-N}.$$

We observe that there exists $c_8 > 0$ such that for $0 < |x| < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha[\phi^p](x) &\le c_8 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_2(0)} |y|^{\alpha-N+\tau} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2N}} dy + c_8 \int_{B_2(0)} \frac{|y|^\tau}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy \\ &\le c_9 + c_9 |x|^{\alpha+\tau} \int_{B_{\frac{2}{|x|}}(0)} \frac{|z|^\tau}{|e_x - z|^{N-\alpha}} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where $e_x = \frac{x}{|x|}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\frac{2}{|x|}}(0)} \frac{|z|^\tau}{|e_x - z|^{N-\alpha}} dz &\le c_{10} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(e_x)} \frac{1}{|e_x - z|^{N-\alpha}} dz + c_{10} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)} |z|^\tau dz \\ &\quad + c_{10} \int_{B_{\frac{2}{|x|}}(0)} (1+|z|)^{\tau+\alpha-N} dz \\ &\le c_{11} + c_{11} |x|^{-\tau-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists $c_{12} > 0$ such that

$$I_\alpha[\phi^p](x) \le c_{12} + c_{12} |x|^{\alpha+\tau p} \quad \text{for} \;\; 0 < |x| < 1.$$

By the fact that

$$(a+b)^t \le 2^{t+1}(a^t + b^t) \quad \text{for} \quad t,\, a, \text{ and } b > 0,$$

we have that for $|x| > 1$,

$$I_\alpha[w_k^p] w_k^q(x) \le c_8 k^{p+q} (r_0 + |x|)^{\max\{\alpha-N,\, \alpha+\tau_0 p\}+\tau_0 q},$$

and for $0 < |x| < 1$,

$$I_\alpha[w_k^p] w_k^q(x) \le c_9 k^{p+q} [|x|^{\alpha-(N-2)(p+q)} + 1].$$

Tighter with (3.7), to obtain the inequality

$$I_\alpha[w_k^p] w_k^q(x) \le \frac{1}{2} w_k + + c(\tau) k r^{\tau-2} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2N}}, \tag{3.8}$$

it requires that

$$\max\{\alpha - N,\, \alpha + \tau_0 p\} + \tau_0 q \le \tau_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha - (N-2)(p+q) \ge \tau - 2,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\tau_0 \le -\frac{\alpha}{p+q-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau \le 2 + \alpha - (N-2)(p+q). \tag{3.9}$$

The first inequality of (3.9) reads as

$$\max\{N-2,\, \frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}\} \ge \frac{\alpha}{p+q-1},$$

which is (1.4). The first inequality of (3.9) holds by the choosing of τ. Now (3.8) holds if

$$c_9 k^{p+q} \le (\frac{1}{2} + c(\tau)) k,$$

thus, there exists $k_0 > 0$ such for $k \in (0, k_0)$ the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w_k(x) + w_k(x) &\ge \frac{1}{2} w_k + c(\tau) |x|^{\tau-2} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2N}} \\ &\ge I_\alpha[w_k^p] w_k^q(x), \quad \forall\, |x| > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for existence part. For any $k \in (0, k_0)$ where k_0 is given by Lemma 3.2, we define the iterating sequence $\{v_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ by

$$v_0 := k\Gamma_0 > 0$$

and

$$v_n = \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[v_{n-1}^p]v_{n-1}^q] + k\Gamma_0.$$

Observing that

$$v_1 = \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[v_0^p]v_0^q] + k\Gamma_0 > v_0$$

and assuming that

$$v_{n-1} \geq v_{n-2} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\},$$

we deduce that

$$v_n = \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[v_{n-1}^p]v_{n-1}^q] + k\Gamma_0 \geq \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[v_{n-2}^p]v_{n-2}^q] + k\Gamma_0 = v_{n-1}.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{v_n\}_n$ is a increasing with respect to n. Moveover, we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_n[(-\Delta\xi) + \xi]\,dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} I_\alpha[v_{n-1}^p]v_{n-1}^q\xi\,dx + k\xi(0), \quad \forall \xi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{3.10}$$

From Lemma 3.2, and the definition of w_k, we have $w_k > v_0$ and

$$v_1 = \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[v_0^p]v_0^q] + k\Gamma_0 \leq \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[w_k^p]w_k^q] + kw_k = w_k.$$

Inductively, we obtain

$$v_n \leq w_k \tag{3.11}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, the sequence $\{v_n\}_n$ converges. Let $u_k := \lim_{n\to\infty} v_n$. By (3.10), u_k is a weak solution of (1.5) and satisfies (1.4).

For $k \leq k_q$, we have that $u_k \leq w_{t_q}$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, so $u_k \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $I_\alpha[u_k^p]u_k^q$ is bounded uniformly locally in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, then u_k is a classical solution of (1.1).

We claim that u_k is the minimal solution of (1.1), that is, for any positive solution u of (1.5), we always have $u_k \leq u$. Indeed, there holds

$$u = \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[u^p]u^q] + k\Gamma_0 \geq v_0,$$

and then

$$u = \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[u^p]u^q] + k\Gamma_0 \geq \mathbb{G}[I_\alpha[v_0^p]v_0^q] + k\Gamma_0 = v_1.$$

We may show inductively that

$$u \geq v_n$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The claim follows. □

3.3. **Decay at infinity.** It is remaind to prove the decay at infinity of u_k satisfies (1.12) or (1.14) under the conditions (1.11) and (1.13) respectively. From Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 2.1, we have that the minimal solution u_k of (1.5) has the decay

$$\limsup_{|x|\to+\infty} u_k(x)|x|^{-\tau_0} \leq k \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{|x|\to+\infty} u_k(x)|x|^{-\tau_0} > 0. \tag{3.12}$$

So when (p, q) satisfies

$$(1 - \frac{\alpha}{N})p + q > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p + q < \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2}, \tag{3.13}$$

then the minimal solution $u_k^p(x) \leq c|x|^{\tau_0 p}$ with $-\tau_0 p > N$ and $u^p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. In this case, we employee the idea in [18] to refine the decay estimate in the case (1.11).

When

$$(1 - \frac{\alpha}{N})p + q \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 + \frac{\alpha}{N-2} \leq p + q < \frac{N+\alpha}{N-2}, \tag{3.14}$$

we see that u_k^p is no longer in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$u_k^p(x) \le 3k|x|^{-(N-2)p}, \qquad |x| > 1,$$

where we note that $(N-2)p \in (\alpha, N)$.

We first prove the following

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that $\alpha \in (0, N)$, $\beta > N$ and the nonnegative function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfies*

$$f_\infty := \sup_{|x|>r_0} f(x)|x|^\beta < +\infty. \tag{3.15}$$

Let $I_\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{|x|^{N-\alpha}}$, then for $|x| > r_0$ large,

$$\left| I_\alpha[f](x) - \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} I_\alpha(x) \right| \le \frac{c_{10}}{|x|^{N-\alpha+\gamma}}, \tag{3.16}$$

holds for $\gamma = \frac{\beta - N}{1+\beta-N}$ and $c_{10} > 0$ depending on α, β, N and f_∞.

Proof. For $|x| > r_0$ large enough and $R = |x|^{1-\gamma}$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{(|x|+R)^{N-\alpha}} \int_{B_R(0)} f(y)dy \le \int_{B_R(0)} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy \le \frac{1}{(|x|-R)^{N-\alpha}} \int_{B_R(0)} f(y)dy. \tag{3.17}$$

We observe that

$$\frac{1}{(|x|-R)^{N-\alpha}} \le \frac{1}{|x|^{N-\alpha}} \left(1 + c_{11}\frac{R}{|x|}\right),$$

$$\frac{1}{(|x|+R)^{N-\alpha}} \ge \frac{1}{|x|^{N-\alpha}} \left(1 - c_{11}\frac{R}{|x|}\right)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} f(y)dy \le f_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} |y|^{-\beta} dy = c_{12} f_\infty R^{N-\beta},$$

where c_{11}, $c_{12} > 0$ are independent of R. That means

$$\left| \int_{B_R(0)} f(y)dy - \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \right| \le c_{12} f_\infty R^{N-\beta}.$$

Therefore, from (3.17) we have that

$$\left| \int_{B_R(0)} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy - \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} I_\alpha(x) \right| \le \frac{c_{13}}{|x|^{N-\alpha+\gamma}}. \tag{3.18}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy &\le f_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}|y|^\beta} dy \\ &= f_\infty \frac{1}{|x|^{\beta-\alpha}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{R}{|x|}}(0)} \frac{1}{|e_x - z|^{N-\alpha}|z|^\beta} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where $e_x = \frac{x}{|x|}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{R}{|x|}}(0)} \frac{1}{|e_x - z|^{N-\alpha}|z|^\beta} dz \\
&\leq 2^\beta \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(e_x)} \frac{1}{|e_x - z|^{N-\alpha}} dz + 2^{N-\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{\frac{R}{|x|}}(0)} \frac{1}{|z|^\beta} dz \\
&\leq c_{14} \left(\frac{R}{|x|}\right)^{N-\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that the first term $\int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}(e_x)} \frac{1}{|e_x - z|^{N-\alpha}} dz$ is bounded. Thus,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_R(0)} \frac{f(y)}{|x-y|^{N-\alpha}} dy \leq c_{14} f_\infty \frac{1}{|x|^{\beta-\alpha}} \left(\frac{R}{|x|}\right)^{N-\beta} = \frac{c_{14} f_\infty}{|x|^{N-\alpha+\gamma}}, \tag{3.19}$$

since $\beta - \alpha + \gamma(N-\beta) = N - \alpha + \gamma$. Therefore the estimates (3.18) and (3.19) imply (3.16). □

Before to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3, we need also the following

Lemma 3.3. [19, Lemma 6.7] *Assume that u is a solution of the equation*

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\Delta u + \mu u = \frac{\nu}{|x|^\sigma} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_r(0), \\
&\lim_{|x| \to +\infty} u(x) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where parameters μ, ν, σ, r are positive. Then we have

$$\lim_{|x| \to +\infty} u(x)|x|^\sigma = \frac{\nu}{\mu}.$$

Proof of (1.12) and (1.14) in Theorem 1.3. (1.14) follows by (3.12). Next we prove (1.12).

Step 1. From Lemma 3.2, we have that

$$u_k(x) \leq k|x|^{-\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| > r_0.$$

From $(1 - \frac{\alpha}{N})p + q > 1$, we have that $\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q} p > N$ and

$$u_k^p(x) \leq k^p |x|^{-\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q} p} \leq k^p |x|^{-N} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| > r_0.$$

Moreover, $u_k^p \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by Lemma 3.2. From Proposition 3.1 with $\gamma = \frac{\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q} p - N}{1 + \frac{N-\alpha}{1-q} p - N}$, there exists $c_{15} > 0$ such that

$$\|u_k^p\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} I_\alpha(x) - \frac{c_{15}}{|x|^{N-\alpha+\gamma}} \leq I_\alpha[u_k^p](x) \leq \|u_k^p\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} I_\alpha(x) + \frac{c_{15}}{|x|^{N-\alpha+\gamma}}, \quad |x| > r. \tag{3.20}$$

Let $w = u_k^{1-q}$, then

$$-\Delta w + (1-q) w \geq (1-q) \|u_k^p\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} I_\alpha(x) - c_{16} \frac{1}{|x|^{N-\alpha+\gamma}},$$

Then by Lemma 3.3 and Comparison Principle for $-\Delta + (1-q)$, we obtain that

$$\liminf_{|x| \to +\infty} w(x)|x|^{N-\alpha} \geq \|u_k^p\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}.$$

Then

$$\liminf_{|x| \to +\infty} u_k(x)|x|^{\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}} \geq \|u_k^p\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-q}}.$$

Step 2. From the Young's inequality, we have that

$$I[u_k^p]u_k^q \le (1-q)I[u_k^p]^{\frac{1}{1-q}} + qu_k$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u_k + (1-q)u_k &\le (1-q)I[u_k^p]^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \\ &\le (1-q)\|u_k^p\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-q}}|x|^{-\frac{N-\alpha}{1-q}}(x) + c_{17}|x|^{-\frac{N-\alpha+\gamma}{1-q}}, \end{aligned}$$

then by Lemma 3.3 and comparison principle for $-\Delta + (1-q)$, we have that

$$\limsup_{|x|\to+\infty} u_k(x)|x|^{N-\alpha} \le \|u_k^p\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-q}}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} u_k(x)|x|^{N-\alpha} = \|u_k^p\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$$

and this completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

Acknowledgements: Huyuan Chen is partially supported by NNSF of China, No:11401270, by SRF for ROCS, SEM and by the Jiangxi Provincial Natural Science Foundation, No: 20161ACB20007. Feng Zhou is partially supported by NSFC (11271133 and 11431005) and Shanghai Key Laboratory of PMMP.

References

[1] P. Aviles, Local behaviour of the solutions of some elliptic equations, *Comm. Math. Phys. 108*, 177-192 (1987).
[2] Ph. Bénilan and H. Brezis, Nonlinear problems related to the Thomas-Fermi equation, *J. Evolution Eq. 3*, 673-770 (2003).
[3] M. F. Bidaut-Véron and L. Vivier, An elliptic semilinear equation with source term involving boundary measures: the subcritical case, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 16*, 477-513 (2000).
[4] H. Brezis and P. Lions, A note on isolated singularities for linear elliptic equations, in Mathematical Analysis and Applications, *Acad. Press,* 263-266 (1981).
[5] L. Caffarelli, B. Gidas and J. Spruck, Asymptotic symmetry and local behaviour of semilinear elliptic equations with critical Sobolev growth, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 42*, 271-297 (1989).
[6] H. Chen and F. Zhou, Classification of isolated singularities of positive solutions for Choquard equations, *J. Diff. Eq. 261,* 6668-6698 (2016).
[7] E. Dancer, Y. Du, and Z. Guo, Finite Morse index solutions of an elliptic equation with supercritical exponent, *J. Diff. Eq., 250(8),* 3281-3310 (2011).
[8] E. Dancer, Z. Guo and J. Wei, Non-radial singular solutions of Lane-Emden equation in $\mathbb{R}^N$, *Indiana Univ. Math. J. 61,* 1971-1996 (2012).
[9] M. Ghergu, S. Taliaferro, Pointwise Bounds and Blow-up for Choquard- Pekar Inequalities at an Isolated Singularity, *J. Diff. Eq., 261,* 189-217 (2016).
[10] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, Global and local behaviour of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 34*, 525-598 (1981).
[11] D. Gogny and P. Lions, Hartree-Fock theory in nuclear physics, *Modélisation Math. Anal. Numér. 20*, 571-637 (1986).
[12] E. P. Gross, Physics of Many-particle Systems, *Gordon Breach, New York, 1* (1996).
[13] T. Kato, Schrödinger operators with singular potentials, *Israel J. Math. 13*, 135C148 (1972).
[14] E. H. Lieb, Existence and uniqueness of the minimizing solution of Choquard's nonlinear equation, *Stud. Appl. Math. 57*, 93-105 (1977).
[15] P. Lions, Isolated singularities in semilinear problems, *J. Diff. Eq. 38(3)*, 441-450 (1980).
[16] P. Lions, The Choquard equation and related questions, *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications 4(6)*, 1063-1072 (1980).
[17] E. H. Lieb and B Simon, The Hartree-Fock theory for Coulomb systems, *Comm. Math. Phys. 53*, 185-194 (1977).

[18] L. Ma and L. Zhao, Classification of positive solitary solutions of the nonlinear Choquard equation, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 195(2)*, 455-467 (2010).
[19] M. Marcus and L. Véron, Removable singularities and boundary traces, *J. Math. Pures Appl. 80*, 879-900 (2001).
[20] V. Moroz, J. Van Schaftingen, Groundstates of nonlinear Choquard equations: existence, qualitative properties and decay asymptotics, *J. Funct. Anal. 265*, 153-184 (2013).
[21] V. Moroz and J. Van Schaftingen, A guide to the Choquard equation, *arXiv:1606.02158* (2016).
[22] V. Ol'khov, Soliton solutions of equations with inertial non-linearity, *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics 51*, 414-415 (1982).
[23] L. Véron, Elliptic equations involving Measures, Stationary Partial Differential equations, *Vol. I, 593-712, Handb. Differ. Equ. North-Holland, Amsterdam* (2004).